

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

December 13, 2000

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Dan Maks called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Dan Maks, Planning Commissioners Sharon Dunham, Eric Johansen, Brian Lynott and Vlad Voytilla. Planning Commissioners Barnard and Heckman were excused.

Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Associate Planner Veronica Smith, Associate Planner Jeff Salvon, Associate Planner John Osterberg, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Maks, who presented the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Chairman Maks asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Principal Planner Hal Bergsma suggested that the order of the agenda items be revised, specifically that the new business items (CPA 99-00015, TA 99-00006, CPA 99-00014 and TA 99-00005), regarding Title 3 and Goal 5, which he referred to as a basically perfunctory matter, be considered first. He suggested that old business items (CPA 2000-0011/TA 2000-0008 -- Natural, Cultural, Historic, Scenic, Open Space and Energy Resources Element and CPA 2000-0010 -- Environmental Quality and Safety Element) be considered next, and that CPA 2000-0009 -- Housing Element be considered last.

Mr. Bergsma discussed a meeting he had attended with Community Development Director Joe Grillo, Development Services Manager Irish Bunnell and Dr. Bob Fisher, the new Assistant Superintendent for the Beaverton School District, adding that the school district's attorney, Jack Orchard and James Lynch of the

1 school district had also been present. He noted that they had discussed planning
2 issues involving the school district, including their ongoing facilities planning
3 effort, plans for the Merlo Station area and bus storage facilities, expressing his
4 opinion that the meeting had been productive.

5
6 7:04 p.m. to 7:14 p.m. -- break.

7

8 **OLD BUSINESS:**

9

10 Chairman Maks discussed last week's land use action regarding the Sexton Crest
11 Development Conditional Use Permit, observing that staff has prepared and
12 submitted the land use orders that he would like to review line by line to make
13 certain that they reflect the intent of the Planning Commissioners through their
14 deliberation process.

15

16 On question, all Planning Commissioners agreed that Condition of Approval No.
17 1 is correct.

18

19 Chairman Maks referred to Condition of Approval No. 2, observing that there had
20 been consensus on revising the "shoulds" to "shalls". Noting that there had been
21 no discussion on revising the "coulds" to "mays", he advised staff that the "mays"
22 need to be changed back to "coulds".

23

24 Chairman Maks referred to Condition of Approval No. 2.4, expressing his opinion
25 that while he disagreed, this condition reflects the intent of the majority of the
26 Planning Commissioners, adding that the first sentence stays.

27

28 Chairman Maks observed that the elimination of Condition of Approval No. 2.7,
29 had not been discussed or determined, directing staff to leave this condition in.

30

31 Chairman Maks referred to Condition of Approval No. 3, adding that the
32 consensus is a reflection of his motion, specifically "Staff Report, as amended".

33

34 Chairman Maks referred to Condition of Approval No. 4, adding that he had
35 directed staff to identify and address concerns expressed by Commissioner
36 Johansen.

37

38 On question, Commissioner Johansen advised Chairman Maks that his intent at
39 the time had specified that he did not want construction traffic traveling through
40 the neighborhood to the north. He mentioned that he had also expressed concern
41 with the functioning of Murray Boulevard, expressing his opinion that these
42 issues had been addressed by this specific language.

43

44 Observing that the meeting had been lengthy, Commissioner Voytilla noted that
45 there had been some discussion with the functions of the construction traffic.

46

1 Commissioner Johansen advised Commissioner Voytilla that the intent had been
2 to have Maverick Terrace provide the access for the construction traffic.

3
4 Observing that there had been a number of issues addressed, Chairman Maks
5 noted that Commissioner Johansen had wanted to make certain that the light was
6 completed prior to initiation of project. He mentioned that the secondary issue
7 was with regard to Neighborhood Meeting notes, specifically that construction
8 traffic would occur on Maverick Terrace and that 148th Avenue would be blocked
9 at the request of the neighborhood. He noted that he had indicated that he did not
10 want 148th Avenue to be blocked, because it would be platted as a public street.

11
12 Chairman Maks referred to Condition of Approval No. 4, as presented by staff,
13 questioning whether this condition addresses the intent of the Planning
14 Commission as determined by consensus.

15
16 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that Condition of Approval No. 4,
17 as presented by staff, does not address the intent of the Planning Commission as
18 determined at last week's Public Hearing.

19
20 Chairman Maks directed staff to revise the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Land
21 Use Order to reflect the corrections discussed this evening, including the right
22 hand turn lane.

23
24 Chairman Maks referred to the Tree Preservation Plan (TPP) Land Use Order,
25 observing that only one change is necessary.

26
27 Commissioner Dunham advised Chairman Maks that the necessary change
28 pertains to Condition of Approval No. 5.

29
30 Expressing his appreciation to Mr. Osterberg, Chairman Maks requested that he
31 make the necessary revisions and return the Land Use Orders for signature.

32
33 **NEW BUSINESS:**

34
35 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

36
37 Chairman Maks opened the Public Hearing and read the format for Public
38 Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members.
39 No one in the audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of
40 the agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be
41 postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of
42 interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no
43 response.

44
45 **Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Code.**

The Planning Commission will conduct a public hearing on the following Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments, which are in ordinance form. This hearing will be conducted to allow public testimony following new notice to property owners who had not previously received notice. The Planning Commission conducted public hearings on the proposals prior to incorporating them into ordinance form. A recommendation of the ordinances will be considered by the City Council at the time of Ordinance adoption.

A. CPA 99-00015 -- TITLE 3 WATER QUALITY AND FLOOD MANAGEMENT

An ordinance embodying this proposal would amend the Comprehensive Plan text by adding text to comply with the following requirements: 1) Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan Title 3 (Water Quality and Flood Management Conservation); 2) New Unified Sewerage Agency Water Quality Requirements; and 3) Statewide Planning Goals 6 (Air, Water and Land Resources Quality) and 7 (Areas Subject to Natural Resources and Hazards) as called for in the City's Periodic Review Work Tasks numbered 4 and 5.

B. TA 99-00006 -- TITLE 3 WATER QUALITY AND FLOOD MANAGEMENT

An ordinance embodying this proposal would amend the Beaverton Development Code, Beaverton City Code Chapter 9, and the Engineering Design Manual and Standard Drawings to add text in compliance with the following requirements: 1) Metro Urban Growth management Functional plan Title 3; 2) New Unified Sewerage Agency Water Quality Requirements; and 3) Statewide Planning Goals 6 and 7 as called for in the City's Periodic Review Work Tasks numbered 4 and 5.

C. CPA 99-00014 -- GOAL 5 RIPARIAN & WETLAND PROTECTION

An ordinance embodying this proposal would amend the Comprehensive Plan text by adding text to protect significant riparian corridors and wetlands identified in Beaverton's Local Wetland Inventory adopted pursuant to Statewide Planning Goal 5 (Natural Resources, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Open Spaces) as called for in the City's Periodic Review Work Task number 3.

D. TA 99-00005 -- GOAL 5 RIPARIAN & WETLAND PROTECTION

An ordinance embodying this proposal would amend the Development Code text and the Engineering Design Manual and Standard Drawings to add text protecting significant riparian corridors and wetlands identified in Beaverton's Local Wetland Inventory adopted pursuant to Statewide Planning Goal 5 as called for in the City's Periodic Review Work Task number 3.

Ms. Smith presented the Staff Report, observing that the purpose of the hearing was to correct a BMSG notice deficiency. The proposed amendments are the same as previously approved by the Planning Commission and memorialized by Land Use Order Nos. 1341, 1342, 1343 and 1344. She added that she had received several telephone calls from several citizens requesting clarification of

1 the notification they had received. Concluding, she recommend approval of the
2 application, adding that there is no indication that any member of the public
3 intends to testify at this time.

4
5 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

6
7 On question, no member of the public appeared to testify at this time.

8
9 On question, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura commented that this action is
10 essentially a curative proceeding to allow notices to be submitted to individuals
11 who had not received them, providing the opportunity to testify. He pointed out
12 that all necessary actions related to the Measure 56 notice have been addressed.

13
14 The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

15
16 Commissioner Voytilla **MOVED** and Commissioner Lynott **SECONDED** a
17 motion to forward all orders and ordinances to the City Council with regard to
18 CPA 99-0015/TA 99-00006 -- Title 3 Water Quality and Flood Management; and
19 CPA 99-00014/TA 99-00005 -- Goal 5 Riparian and Wetland Protection, based
20 upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the Public Hearing on
21 the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the
22 Staff Memorandum dated November 13, 2000, Staff Reports dated July 19, 2000
23 and August 16, 2000, and based upon this Public Hearing.

24
25 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

26
27 **OLD BUSINESS:**

28
29 Chairman Maks opened the Public Hearing and read the format for Public
30 Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members.
31 No one in the audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of
32 the agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be
33 postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of
34 interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no
35 response.

36
37 **CONTINUANCES:**

38
39 **A. CPA 2000-0011/TA 2000-0008 -- NATURAL, CULTURAL, HISTORIC,**
40 **SCENIC, OPEN SPACE AND ENERGY RESOURCES ELEMENT OF**
41 **THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AND PORTIONS OF THE**
42 **DEVELOPMENT CODE**

43 (Continued from November 29, 2000)

44 The proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan will revise and update
45 existing language to demonstrate compliance with Periodic Review Work Task
46 No. 3 requirements. The proposed amendments would revise natural resources

1 protection policies for: 1. Groundwater, to establish guidelines for future
2 development of a City wellhead protection program; and 2. Energy, to include a
3 request to remove the inactive Sexton Mountain and Progress Quarry aggregate
4 sites from the City's natural resource inventory. This supplemental Staff Report,
5 dated November 29, 2000, modifies the November 8, 2000 proposal to the
6 following sections: 7.2 Cultural and Historic Resources; 7.3 Natural Resources;
7 7.3.5 Wildlife Habitat; and 7.4 Scenic Views and Sites. In addition,
8 Development Code text Chapter 20, Section 20.20.90.D3 is proposed for deletion.
9 Other proposed text revisions are minor edits, or non-substantive changes, and
10 reflect the organizational restructuring of the Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 7
11 Natural, Cultural, Historic, Scenic, Open Space and Energy Resources. To be
12 consistent, sections of the Development Code may require modifications. The
13 proposed amendments respond to State Periodic Review requirements and address
14 Statewide Planning Goal 5 (Open Space, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural
15 Resources).

16
17 Ms. Smith presented the Staff Report and briefly clarified what has been
18 introduced into the record, as follows: 1) Staff Report, dated November 8, 2000;
19 Draft Proposal, dated November 8, 2000; Memorandum, dated November 22,
20 2000, requesting a continuance to December 13, 2000; and Supplemental Staff
21 Report, dated November 29, 2000, which included the codified document for the
22 proposed amendments. Observing that Commissioner Heckman is not present,
23 she noted that she had discussed this issue with him and that he had submitted no
24 revisions. She mentioned several minor text revisions, adding that due to time
25 constraints, she would like to review the Staff Report section by section, adding
26 that she could respond to questions as they occurred.

27
28 Chairman Maks suggested that Ms. Smith submit her revisions, followed by
29 questions from the Planning Commissioners.

30
31 Ms. Smith reviewed her corrections to Exhibit A.2 of the Comprehensive Plan
32 Amendment, as follows:

- 33
34 1) page 13, line 29, Action 1, requesting deletion of the word "for";
35
36 2) page 15, line 13, Action 1, requesting that it be amended, as follows:
37 "Develop and implement a fish habitat protection program in
38 compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 5"; and
39
40 3) page 19, line 7, The Goal, 7.41 Goal, requesting that it be amended, as
41 follows: "conserve significant scenic views and sites and the values
42 they add to the community."
43

44 Ms. Smith described other recommended revisions, specifically deletion of
45 Section 20.20.90.D.3; and new text proposed for Goal 7.1.1, based on discussion
46 pertaining to the direction of Chairman Maks, specifically that there be only one

1 goal for that particular section. At the request of Commissioner Dunham, staff
2 reformatted the chapter. Concluding her presentation of significant changes to the
3 applications, she offered to respond to any comments and questions.

4
5 Commissioner Voytilla referred to Exhibit A.2.14, page 14, lines 35 through 40,
6 specifically reference to regulations of other agencies including, but not limited
7 to, and questioned whether the NMFS 4(d) rule had been adopted and actually
8 agreed upon as being an acceptable level of protection.

9
10 Ms. Smith responded that this document has been approved and that the Federal
11 regulations are currently in effect.

12
13 Mr. Bergsma advised Commissioner Voytilla that not everyone is in agreement
14 and that several appeals have been filed.

15
16 Commissioner Dunham referred to Section A.2 of the strike-through version, page
17 11, lines 16 and 17, specifically whether the economic, social and environmental
18 issues are tied into the ESEE, expressing her opinion that energy should be added,
19 to reflect the full ESEE.

20
21 Ms. Smith concurred.

22
23 Commissioner Dunham referred to page 9, line 17, E., questioning the feasibility
24 of adding or developing some type of action to make it more real.

25
26 Observing that she would like this to occur, Ms. Smith advised Commissioner
27 Dunham that staff is still in the draft stages of how to implement this program and
28 suggested that this be addressed at a later time.

29
30 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

31
32 On question, no member of the public appeared to testify at this time.

33
34 On question, Mr. Naemura had no comments or questions at this time.

35
36 The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

37
38 Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and Commissioner Dunham **SECONDED** a
39 motion to approve CPA 2000-0011 -- Natural, Cultural, Historic, Scenic, Open
40 Space and Energy Resources Element of the Comprehensive Plan, and portions of
41 the Development Code, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented
42 during the Public Hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings
43 and conclusions found in the Staff Reports and Memorandums dated November 8,
44 2000; November 22, 2000, and November 29, 2000, as amended, and based upon
45 this Public Hearing.
46

1 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

2

3 Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and Commissioner Dunham **SECONDED** a
4 motion to approve TA 2000-0008-- Natural, Cultural, Historic, Scenic, Open
5 Space and Energy Resources Element of the Comprehensive Plan, and portions of
6 the Development Code, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented
7 during the Public Hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings
8 and conclusions found in the Staff Reports and Memorandums dated November 8,
9 2000; November 22, 2000, and November 29, 2000, as amended, and based upon
10 this Public Hearing.

11

12 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

13

14 **B. CPA 2000-0010/TA 2000-0009 -- ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND**
15 **SAFETY CODE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AND PORTIONS**
16 **OF THE DEVELOPMENT CODE**

17 (Continued from November 8, 2000)

18 The proposed amendments would revise the Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 8
19 Environmental Quality and Safety with policy updates to sections on air quality,
20 noise, seismic hazards, geological hazards and solid and hazardous waste.
21 Additional proposed text revisions are minor edits, or non-substantive changes,
22 and reflect the organizational restructuring of the Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 8
23 element. To be consistent, sections of the Development Code may require
24 modifications. The proposed amendments respond to State Periodic Review
25 requirements and address Statewide Planning Goal 6 (Air, Water and Land
26 Resources Quality), and Goal 7 (Areas Subject to Natural Disasters and Hazards).

27

28 Ms. Smith presented the Staff Report and clarified the documents that have been
29 received to date, as follows: 1) Memorandum dated October 31, 2000; 2)
30 Memorandum dated November 8, 2000; 3) Staff Report dated December 13,
31 2000; and 4) Memorandum, with update, dated December 1, 2000. She
32 mentioned that there are some modifications, which she described as very minor
33 in nature, adding that she had received no telephone calls and no written
34 testimony from the public regarding this request. Concluding, she observed that
35 no members of the public are present to testify and recommended approval of the
36 applications.

37

38 Chairman Maks assured Ms. Smith that although no public is present to testify,
39 the Planning Commissioners value her efforts.

40

41 Commissioner Dunham expressed her approval of the documents, and referred to
42 page 3 of the December 1, 2000 Memorandum, emphasizing that it is great to see
43 actual goals toward education. She referred to Action 5, regarding Sexton
44 Mountain Rock Quarry, expressing her agreement that the site is a component of
45 the landscaping. She referred to page 5, line 15, suggesting that the word maybe
46 should be split. She referred to page 5, line 34, suggesting the word emissions,

1 rather than omissions. She referred to page 7, specifically meeting design
2 standards including but not limited to, and questioned whether there had been
3 some jockeying of the position of the Walker Road Auto building for noise
4 mitigation purposes.

5
6 Chairman Maks advised Commissioner Dunham that a wall had been installed,
7 rather than revising the position of the building at Walker Road Auto.

8
9 Commissioner Dunham questioned whether there had been some discussion
10 regarding the location of the opening of that building.

11
12 Chairman Maks informed Commissioner Dunham that although the issue had
13 been discussed, the applicant had made the decision to reposition the building.

14
15 Commissioner Dunham referred to page 7, line 32, suggesting that it be amended,
16 as follows: "moderate to ~~great~~ **severe** earthquakes".

17
18 Ms. Smith advised Commissioner Dunham that "great" is the technical term
19 utilized in literature and information, adding that this term is also referenced by
20 Metro.

21
22 Commissioner Dunham referred to page 9, Action 1, specifically whether
23 geological hazard sites in the City of Beaverton would be inventoried, mapped or
24 identified in some specific manner.

25
26 Ms. Smith noted that how these areas would be identified has not been specified,
27 adding that staff is considering preparing a hazard mitigation plan. This plan
28 would identify any areas that present any imminent hazard. She pointed out that
29 the scope of this particular project merely sets the stage to identify the need and
30 prepare action plans for the future.

31
32 Chairman Maks questioned the feasibility of including in Action 1, as follows:
33 "by relations to these sites through engineering standards and site development
34 design criteria **and Development Code** to allow, limit or prohibit development,
35 as appropriate."

36
37 Ms. Smith advised Chairman Maks that staff had determined that "as appropriate"
38 would serve as their "catch-all" phrase, noting that his words would be added.

39
40 Commissioner Voytilla referred to potential geological hazards, encouraging
41 utilization of the existing information and maps, if possible.

42
43 Ms. Smith advised Commissioner Voytilla that she envisions further refinement
44 to the accuracy of these maps.

45

1 Commissioner Voytilla pointed out that this could be a very expensive process
2 without sufficient staff to make this determination.

3
4 Ms. Smith emphasized the importance of not just accepting but actually reviewing
5 the map.

6
7 Commissioner Voytilla advised Ms. Smith that he is considering this map for
8 utilization as a tool for an individual to utilize prior to initiating a project.

9
10 Mr. Bergsma observed that this issue could be addressed in the same manner as
11 wetlands through the Local Wetlands Inventory, specifically by identification of
12 the location of the resource, adding that any individual wanting to develop a
13 property would have to re-identify the exact location of the resource.

14
15 Ms. Smith mentioned that Statewide Planning Goal 7 is under revision, adding
16 that DLCDC is proceeding with their recommendations for revisions to that goal.
17 She pointed out that the draft that she had reviewed had indicated that there would
18 be a requirement to enact some legislation and code requirements.

19
20 Commissioner Lynott questioned whether an individual developing on a
21 hazardous site would need to address different development criteria.

22
23 Ms. Smith advised Commissioner Lynott that this would be similar to how the
24 City of Beaverton would limit development on a particular area within that site.

25
26 On question, Mr. Naemura indicated that he had no questions or comments.

27
28 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

29
30 On question, no member of the public appeared to testify at this time.

31
32 The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

33
34 Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and Commissioner Voytilla **SECONDED** a
35 motion to approve CPA 2000-0010 -- Environmental Quality and Safety Element
36 of the Comprehensive Plan, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits
37 presented during the Public Hearing on the matter and upon the background facts,
38 findings and conclusions found in the documents dated October 31, 2000;
39 November 8, 2000; December 1, 2000; and December 13, 2000, and based upon
40 this Public Hearing, as amended.

41
42 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

43
44 Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and Commissioner Voytilla **SECONDED** a
45 motion to approve TA 2000-0009-- Environmental Quality and Safety Element of
46 portions of the Development Code, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits

presented during the Public Hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Reports dated October 31, 2000; November 8, 2000; December 1, 2000; and December 13, 2000, and based upon this Public Hearing, as amended.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

8:00 p.m. – Ms. Smith left.

C. CPA 2000-0009 -- HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

(Continued from November 8, 2000)

The proposed amendment responds to State Periodic Review Requirements, addresses Statewide Planning Goal 10 (Housing Needs) and proposes a new Housing Element for the Comprehensive Plan. Adoption of this element will establish a base of goals, policies, and actions necessary to address Beaverton's housing needs.

Associate Planner Jeff Salvon presented the Staff Report and a Memorandum addressing Commissioner Heckman's questions and concerns, dated December 13, 2000. Observing that staff is attempting to compile another memo with a map attachment, he mentioned that there had been unfortunate problems with the printer, and requested a continuance until December 20, 2000. Concluding, he apologized for any errors in last week's memo when he was ill and had to call it in, and offered to respond to any comments or questions.

Expressing his preference for submitting questions this week, Commissioner Johansen referred to page 2, line 11, specifically how manufactured housing provides additional density.

Mr. Salvon advised Commissioner Johansen that manufactured housing poses more of a concern from efforts to provide a variety of housing types.

Commissioner Johansen referred to page 3, line 14, questioning the intent of the phrase "the City's internal need".

Mr. Salvon discussed a housing survey that the City conducted earlier this year that identified the number of households that could be classified as unaffordable to the residents that occupy them. This number represents an internal need that is specific to the City of Beaverton. The need for affordable housing is generally evaluated from a regional perspective, however, due to the fact that some jurisdictions bear a greater burden of the need than other jurisdictions. Beaverton's share of that regional burden is greater than its internal need as identified in the housing survey. Mr. Salvon then proceeded to provide the definition for affordable housing as those households that earn less than 50% of

1 the median family income and allocate over 30% of that gross income toward
2 housing costs.

3
4 Commissioner Johansen questioned the feasibility of the City of Beaverton
5 meeting obligations for their share of land supply when it is obvious that we are
6 running out of land, specifically how State law addresses this particular issue.

7
8 Mr. Salvon advised Commissioner Johansen that it is necessary to demonstrate
9 that the City of Beaverton can accommodate the twenty-year need, and if this is
10 not possible, it is Metro's responsibility to acquire more land. He pointed out that
11 the City has substantially complied and come within 91% of their target as
12 illustrated by the City's Buildable Lands Analysis.

13
14 Commissioner Johansen referred to line 36 of page 3, specifically a reference to
15 ORS 197.296 and how the City of Beaverton, who is running out of land, possibly
16 accommodate a 20-year supply.

17
18 Observing that the Buildable Lands Analysis is the responsibility of Metro, Mr.
19 Salvon advised Commissioner Johansen that this analysis could be and has been
20 challenged.

21
22 Commissioner Johansen requested clarification of whether this issue is considered
23 on a regional basis, and Mr. Salvon informed him that this is correct.

24
25 Mr. Bergsma emphasized that the issue involves buildable land as opposed to
26 vacant lands, adding that buildable land is defined as either redevelopable land as
27 well as vacant land. He clarified that most of this land within the City of
28 Beaverton at this point is actually redevelopable land, mostly for higher density
29 housing, adding that the map that should have been available tonight could have
30 identified these properties.

31
32 Commissioner Johansen referred to page 10, specifically reference to the Tualatin
33 Valley Housing Partners and inquired as to why their recommendation for the
34 formation of the Redevelopment Agency was not included as an action item.

35
36 Mr. Salvon advised Commissioner Johansen that this issue would be addressed in
37 another section of the Comprehensive Plan.

38
39 Mr. Bergsma mentioned that there is actually an action item within the Land Use
40 Element that provides for the formation of the Redevelopment Agency, at least
41 for the downtown area.

42
43 Commissioner Voytilla referred to page 5 of the Staff Report, specifically the
44 ORS requirements, and a paragraph on page 15, questioning how zoning relates to
45 income strata.

46

1 Mr. Salvon advised Commissioner Voytilla that income ranges are considered as
2 they relate to the different housing types that they occupy. In consideration of
3 this factor, he explained that it is necessary to determine a nexus between income
4 and housing type. He listed the five housing types, as follows: 1) single-family;
5 2) residential; 3) apartment, two, three and four-plex; 4) condo; and 5) mobile
6 home. Beyond that, it is also necessary to address farm worker housing,
7 government-assisted housing and manufactured housing, which has been
8 addressed separately within the Housing Element.

9

10 Commissioner Voytilla referred to page 10, Attachment A, specifically what is
11 the intent of fast tracking affordable housing.

12

13 Mr. Salvon advised Commissioner Voytilla that this is one of the tools that has
14 been recommended for consideration.

15

16 Commissioner Voytilla referred to Exhibit A, page 1, specifically minimizing
17 concentration of poverty, and questioned how this would be addressed. He
18 referred to page 4, specifically the use of some planning tools and non-land use
19 tools, expressing his opinion that this appears to conflict with some of the prior
20 language,

21

22 Mr. Salvon agreed that this language is very vague, observing that this is basically
23 because Metro does not have the authority to require the City of Beaverton to do
24 anything that is non-land use related.

25

26 Commissioner Voytilla requested clarification of the phrase significant roles,
27 specifically whether they have been identified.

28

29 Mr. Salvon advised Commissioner Voytilla that it is known who some of the
30 partners are, adding that this probably includes the Washington County Section 8
31 Program and the City's Housing Rehabilitation Program, which provide grant
32 money and loans for low-income housing.

33

34 Commissioner Voytilla referred to page 9, Section 1.3.6.A, specifically Metro
35 actions, questioning what is Metro's specific experience at providing affordable
36 housing.

37

38 Mr. Salvon informed Commissioner Voytilla that Metro has no experience at
39 providing affordable housing, adding that this is a new concept and that their staff
40 have spent two years simply identifying the strategies involved.

41

42 Mr. Bergsma observed that the proposed amendments come from the Metro
43 Housing Technical Advisory Committee process, adding that Mayor Drake served
44 on this committee. He explained that staff is only required to *consider* the
45 adoption of certain tools and strategies that would result in the development of
46 affordable housing within the City of Beaverton, adding that staff would re-

1 address this issue in approximately three years to determine what progress has
2 been made. If significant progress has not been made within this period of time, it
3 would become necessary to determine whether enough efforts have been made
4 and what additional efforts are necessary to provide affordable housing within the
5 region.

6
7 Chairman Maks mentioned that he has one global question on affordable housing,
8 specifically where this Comprehensive Plan document provides that we are going
9 to educate the public and change the public opinion with regard to affordable
10 housing. Emphasizing that he understands the need for affordable housing, he
11 pointed out that every single neighborhood association and individual who
12 testifies requests upscale developments within their neighborhoods. He pointed
13 out that progress is not possible until the public recognizes the need and the
14 problems created by the lack of affordable housing within Washington County.

15
16 Mr. Salvon agreed that the Comprehensive Plan does not provide for the need for
17 the public to understand the issue of affordable housing.

18
19 Mr. Bergsma emphasized that although we can educate the public about the need
20 for affordable housing, they are still not going to want it in their neighborhoods.
21 He explained that because the public is concerned with the effect on their property
22 values and the kinds of people they associate with affordable housing, it is
23 difficult to get the public to accept affordable housing.

24
25 Expressing his agreement with Mr. Bergsma, Chairman Maks suggested the
26 possibility of improving the situation by making the public aware of the problems
27 created by the lack of affordable housing.

28
29 Chairman Maks observed that the Development Code provides for compatibility
30 with existing neighborhoods, pointing out the potentially good argument that low-
31 income housing does not necessarily meet this requirement. Noting that he is
32 aware that the problem would not be eliminated, he expressed his opinion that it is
33 possible to improve the situation.

34
35 Commissioner Johansen mentioned the necessity of maintaining our inventory of
36 existing affordable housing as part of our strategy.

37
38 Mr. Salvon emphasized that the provision of affordable housing is largely
39 contingent upon receiving outside subsidies, noting that although it is presently
40 illegal under State law, efforts are being made to initiate a real estate transfer tax.

41
42 Commissioner Voytilla referred to Section 1.3.6.B, specifically that a local
43 jurisdiction's action includes a monitoring process twelve, twenty-four and thirty-
44 six months later. He questioned the feasibility of available staffing to allow the
45 City of Beaverton to provide for this monitoring.

46

Commissioner Lynott referred to the Staff Report, specifically reference to Tualatin Valley Housing Partners, page 5 of 6, number 3, as follows: "create a discretionary fund that pays building permits and system development charges in unique special needs projects". He questioned the possibility of waiving these charges, in certain situations.

Mr. Salvon advised Commissioner Lynott that system development charges could not be waived, adding that these are distributed among to different agencies.

Mr. Bergsma pointed out that unlike Washington County, the City's development review fees do not cover the cost of the development review staff, adding that these fees cover no more than 25% of the actual cost. He mentioned that increasing the subsidy would create more of a burden to the taxpayers.

Mr. Salvon noted that the City of Portland has eight tax exemption programs available, adding that he had been informed that no multi-family projects are approved without some type of abatement.

Chairman Maks requested that Mr. Salvon address his concern with educating the public regarding the need for affordable housing.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

Commissioner Lynott **MOVED** and Commissioner Voytilla **SECONDED** a motion to continue CPA 2000-0009 -- Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan to a date certain of December 20, 2000.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of the meeting of November 1, 2000, submitted. Commissioner Voytilla **MOVED** and Commissioner Lynott **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved as written.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner Dunham, who abstained from voting on this issue.

Minutes of the meeting of November 8, 2000, submitted. Commissioner Dunham referred to line 37 of page 7, requesting that it be amended, as follows: "...while solar energy is not en vogue at this particular time, eventually it ~~would~~ **could** become an issue again..." Commissioner Dunham referred to line 18 of page 5, requesting that the name of the Commissioner who seconded the motion be inserted. Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and Commissioner Voytilla **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved as revised and amended.

1 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

2
3 Minutes of the meeting of November 15, 2000, submitted. Commissioner
4 Voytilla requested that the blank on line 42 of page 13 be amended, as follows:
5 "specifically comments from the arborist." Commissioner Voytilla **MOVED**
6 and Commissioner Lynott **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved as
7 revised and amended.
8

9 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioners Dunham
10 and Johansen, who abstained from voting on this issue.
11

12 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

13
14 Observing that the Planning Commission Luncheon for staff is scheduled in the
15 3rd Floor Conference Room from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Wednesday,
16 December 20, Chairman Maks advised his fellow Planning Commissioners that
17 although the cost has not yet been determined, Commissioner Barnard is taking
18 care of the arrangements.
19

20 Noting that Wednesday, December 20, 2000, would be the final scheduled
21 Planning Commission Meeting for the year 2000, Chairman Maks commented
22 that he has no intention of continuing any items to December 27, 2000,
23 Observing that nominations for office for the following year are generally
24 addressed at this final meeting of the year and that Commissioner Voytilla will
25 not be present, he questioned whether Commissioner Voytilla would be willing to
26 accept a nomination to serve as Chairman of the Planning Commission for the
27 year 2001.
28

29 Commissioner Voytilla agreed, and Chairman Maks requested that the record
30 reflect that Commissioner Voytilla has indicated that he would accept a
31 nomination to serve as Chairman of the Planning Commission for the year 2001.
32

33 Commissioner Lynott commented that he would be willing to accept a nomination
34 to serve as Chairman of the Planning Commission for the year 2001.
35

36 The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.